

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are currently presented and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 23 January 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant continues to argue that Lakritz does not teach and/or reasonably suggest periodically reading current content from interrelated data sources identified as provider sites by a site-to-site relationship manager according to a predetermined schedule, comparing the current content with prior content to identify content changes at a respective provider site, and automatically transferring the changed content to an identified subscriber site. The Examiner maintains the views as presented previously.

The Applicant argues that "The distinctions described above are more evident when considered in light of Lakritz's goal in allowing "a master site to be built that is language and country-independent," which can subsequently serve localized/translated versions to visitors. (See col. 5, lines 10-18). In short, the existence of the visitors is what drives the data movement, not as recited in claim 1." As the Examiner noted previously, Lakritz discloses that "Referring to FIG. 7, the Manager's Console detects when a document in the master

Art Unit: 2143

language has been updated 705." (column 9, lines 44-45) and that "If a document in the master language is subsequently updated--perhaps out-of-date product information on the Web site is being updated--the Console 1202 will immediately alert the Web site manager 1201 that the corresponding foreign language versions of the document are out-of-date and need to be re-translated.". The claims fails to recite any sort of specific predetermined schedule, therefore, the claim encompasses any such sort. In view of the above, it can be reasonably inferred that, upon updating of a document, the system of Lakritz is "scheduled" to "detect when a document in the master language has been updated" and, subsequently, "the Console 1202 will immediately alert the Web site manager 1201 that the corresponding foreign language versions of the document are out-of-date and need to be re-translated".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the

Art Unit: 2143

United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6 623 529 to Lakritz.

Regarding claim 1, Lakritz discloses a globalization management system for managing resources of multiple interrelated data sources corresponding to a plurality of sites accessed through a communications network ("country/language database and file systems"), comprising:

a plurality of target application interfaces ("adaptors"), each of said target application interfaces being respectively coupled to at least one of the interrelated data sources through the communications network (column 10, lines 40-42), each of said target application interfaces including means for converting a protocol of the respective data source ("original format") to a predetermined protocol ("internal format") and said predetermined protocol to said protocol of the respective data source (column 9, lines 4-9; column 10, lines 40-42; column 11, lines 36-60); and

a global management engine ("Workflow Manager") coupled to said plurality of target application interfaces, said global management engine communicating with each of said target application interfaces with said predetermined protocol (column

Art Unit: 2143

11, lines 28-60; column 9, line 64-column 10, line 4), said global management engine including (a) a site-to-site relationship manager for identifying provider ("master site") and subscriber ("site" that has "documents that require translation") relationships, language translation, and localization requirements between the multiplicity of interrelated data sources, (column 9, lines 44-47; column 9, line 64-column 10, line 4) (b) means for periodically reading data representing current content from the multiplicity of interrelated data sources identified as provider sites by said site-to-site relationship manager according to a predetermined schedule, (c) means for comparing said data representing current content with periodically read data representing prior content to identify content changes at a respective provider site (column 9, lines 44-47), and (d) a project manager for automatically transferring said data identified as a content change by said comparing means to at least one of said interrelated data sources identified as a subscriber site by said site-to-site relationship manager (column 11, lines 17-60).

Regarding claim 2, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said project manager includes means for transferring said data identified as

Art Unit: 2143

a content change by said comparing means to a language translation site ("translation resources") through the communications network responsive to said site-to-site relationship manager identifying said content change data as requiring language translation, said project manager including means for receiving data from said language translation site and transferring said received data to at least one of said interrelated data sources identified as subscriber site. (column 9, lines 44-47; column 11, lines 17-60)

Regarding claim 3, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said project manager includes means for localizing said data identified as a content change by said comparing means responsive to said site-to-site relationship manager identifying said content change data as requiring localization. (column 12, lines 20-61)

Regarding claim 4, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said global management engine is implemented on a server coupled to the communications network. (column 14, lines 38-48)

Regarding claim 5, Lakritz discloses the globalization management system as recited in claim 1 where said current content from the interrelated data sources is stored in a repository selected from the group consisting of a database

Art Unit: 2143

system, a file system, a content management system and a combination thereof. ("country/language database and file systems") (see also column 10, lines 27-30 and 40-42)

Claims 6-14 are also rejected since these claims recite a method that contain substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz.

Regarding claim 15, Lakritz discloses the method as recited in claim 1 where said step of identifying includes the step of identifying site content requiring copying of said content for a predetermined site content subscriber as shown above regarding claim 14.

Lakritz does not expressly disclose wherein the identification step associates a HIDE flag with the site content requiring copying, however, Lakritz does disclose that the site content requiring copying is noted by the globalization management system. (column 9, lines 44-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Lakritz since the reference suggests that the site content requiring copying is noted by the globalization management system and that this notation is used to determine which site content requires content (column 9, lines 44-57). In view of these suggestions and teachings shown above, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to modify the reference so that any sort of notation associated with the site content including the use of a flag in order for the site content to be designated to be copied.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,315
Art Unit: 2143

Page 11

/George C. Neurauter, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2143